



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ant maliciously instituted and prosecuted interference proceedings in the patent office, thereby delaying the issuance of a patent to the complainant, the prior applicant. *Held*, that the complainant has no right of action for damages. *Avery & Son v. Case Plow Works*, 163 Fed. Rep. 842 (Circ. Ct., E. D. Wis., July, 1908).

In most jurisdictions of the United States an action for the malicious prosecution of a civil action will lie irrespective of arrest, attachment, or special damage. *Closson v. Staples*, 42 Vt. 209. *Contra*, *Smith v. Michigan Buggy Co.*, 175 Ill. 619. It is universally agreed, however, that the action will lie when there has been special damage other than that involved in defending the suit. See *Smith v. Michigan Buggy Co.*, *supra*. As it does not clearly appear that the plaintiff in the principal case alleged that he had been sued without probable cause, the decision may be supported. But assuming such an averment, the plaintiff according to the Vermont decision should have prevailed. And, it is submitted, the same result should follow even under the Illinois rule. For under the patent statutes an unpatented invention vests in the discoverer an inchoate right to its exclusive use. *Evans v. Weiss*, 2 Wash. (U. S.) 342. This is a property right which may be sold or assigned. *Burton v. Burton Stock Car Co.*, 171 Mass. 437. And the inventor is entitled to perfect the right by patent. *Gayler v. Wilder*, 10 How. (U. S.) 477. Therefore the defendant, by delaying the perfection of the plaintiff's right, must necessarily have caused special damage which should entitle the plaintiff to recover.

MORTGAGES — TRANSFER OF RIGHTS AND PROPERTY — SALE BY MORTGAGOR: RELEASE OF PART OF MORTGAGED PREMISES. — A bought part of a mortgaged tract of land. The rest of the land was then sold to B. The mortgagee, without knowledge of the sale to A, released from the mortgage lien the part sold to B. The value of B's land was equal to the amount of the mortgage. A filed a bill in equity praying that his land be released from the mortgage lien. *Held*, that he is not entitled to such relief. *Schofield v. Wallace*, 39 Pittsb. Leg. J. 41 (C. P., Allegheny Co., Pa., Aug. 1908).

As between purchasers of parts of mortgaged premises, their holdings are subjected to the satisfaction of the mortgage in the inverse order of their alienation. *Savings Bank v. Creswell*, 100 U. S. 630. It follows that if the mortgagee, with knowledge of previous alienations, releases from the mortgage lien portions subsequently alienated, which are of sufficient value to discharge the mortgage debt, those previously alienated are released from the mortgage lien. *Schrack v. Schriener*, 100 Pa. 451. But this rule of charging the lands in the inverse order of their alienation is a rule of equity, and as such should not be applied when it would cause hardship. It is not fair to put upon the mortgagee the duty of keeping himself informed of all conveyances of portions of the land and of the resulting equities claimed by the owners. But any alienee, who intends to claim an equity, should see to it that the mortgagee has notice of the alienation. *Stuyvesant v. Howe*, 1 Sandf. Ch. (N. Y.) 419. The plaintiff in the present case not having given such notice was rightly denied equitable relief.

POLICE POWER — REGULATION OF BUSINESS AND OCCUPATIONS — REQUIREMENT OF BANK DEPOSITORS' GUARANTY FUND. — A statute, passed after the incorporation of the plaintiff, provided that every state bank should pay an annual assessment equal to 1 % of its deposits for the purpose of creating a common guaranty fund for depositors. *Held*, that the statute is constitutional. *Noble State Bank v. Haskell*, 97 Pac. 590 (Okla.).

The statute does not impair the obligation of contracts, for before incorporating the bank the legislature had reserved the right to alter all corporate charters. *Wilson*, Rev. & Ann. St. Okla., 1903, c. 18, § 3; Okla. Const., Art. IX. § 47. See *Railroad Co. v. Maine*, 96 U. S. 499. Even without such reservation, a reasonable exercise of the police power does not come within the inhibition against impairing the obligation of contracts or conflict with other constitutional provisions. *Cummings v. Spaunhorst*, 5 Mo. App. 21. The nature of banking makes it especially a subject for regulation by the police power. Thus,